

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 20 May 1983
TO: VC/NIC - Waterman		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS:		
<p style="text-align: right;">23 MAY 1983</p> <p><i>TO: LINK</i></p> <p><i>THANKS. REMARKS WE ARE COMING AT THIS ISSUE FROM DIFFERENT RECENT EXPERIENCES. YOUR BASIC PREMISE OF THE CENTRALITY OF DYNAMIC CHANGE OF ELITE PERSPECTIVES & THE PARTICIPATION</i></p>		
FROM:		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION
FORM NO. 241 1 FEB 55		REPLACES FORM 36-8 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

OF THE POPULACE IN THIS
PROCESS IS CERTAINLY ONE I
AGREE WITH. IT'S THE
ISSUE OF THE DEGREE OF
INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION BEING
GIVEN TO THIS PROCESS - AS
OPPOSED TO THE E-W
CONFLICT OVERLAY - WHICH
I SEE DIFFERENTLY. PERHAPS
WE COULD DISCUSS FURTHER?

Chile

SECRET

20 May 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Charles Waterman, Vice Chairman, National Intelligence Council

FROM : Lincoln Gordon
National Intelligence Officer at Large

SUBJECT : Of Raps: Bum and Less Bum

1. At the second staff discussion of the recent Gates paper on Meeting the Soviet Challenge in the Third World last Wednesday, 18 May, you charged me with giving the Intelligence Community a "bum rap" for arguing that collection and analysis has been based on too narrow a view of third world countries as passive subjects of a cold war contest between the USSR and ourselves, rather than actors with their own aspirations and concerns. I cheerfully admit to overstatement of my thesis. You are quite correct, for example, that in the Near East a great deal of attention has been given to regional issues and (at least since the Iranian debacle) to Islamic fundamentalism. But I remain convinced that our approach (both in policy and in intelligence) is badly unbalanced, and that far too little attention is paid to the search for positive elements of mutual interest between Third World countries and the US, or (to the extent that generalization can ever be valid in these matters) between Third World and First World as a whole.

2. Since you missed my comments at the 11 May meeting, I will restate the highlights here. I applauded the Gates paper for urging a higher priority for the Third World in US foreign relations (while noting that Truman and Kennedy had discovered this wheel 34 and 22 years ago, respectively) and for urging analytical methods "to provide early warnings of economic, social, and political problems that foreshadow instability and opportunities for exploitation by the USSR or its allies" (Gates paper, page 6). But I criticized his approach for putting central emphasis on "stability" when substantial change is inescapable and the real issues have to do with the kind of change.

3. With appropriate warnings against any kind of generalization about an extremely heterogeneous group of 125 countries, I suggested that for societies to become resistant to Soviet-supported minority coups and power monopolization, their elites need to become engaged in an internationally

SECRET

25X1

SECRET

connected process of economic and technical modernization and their masses need to feel a positive stake in these changes -- hence the importance of social goals and of human rights. I emphasized the extraordinary difficulties of moving in that direction in societies steeped in millennial traditions of landlord-tenant warfare, tribal warfare, religious warfare, and man-woman warfare. Finally, I argued the need for a conceptual framework including a Positive-Sum Game relationship between Third and First Worlds alongside the Zero-Sum (or Negative Sum) relationship between the Second and First Worlds. (That does not mean accepting the nonsense of "New International Economic Order" proposals from the Group of 77, most of which reflect erroneous Zero-Sum Game premises.)

4. The intelligence implications of my argument are partly in agreement with the Gates recommendations, especially his paragraph 3 on page 6. I am troubled by Hal Ford's observation that [REDACTED]

25X1

[REDACTED] From what I have heard about the current Latin American scene, we are much less well equipped today to obtain knowledge of potential mass movements and non-elite attitudes than we were when I was Assistant Secretary of State in the mid-1960s. And our general posture is certainly less conducive to what should be a conviction that the First World is the Third World's natural ally in successful processes of modernization.


Lincoln Gordon

cc: C/NIC
VC/NIC - Meyer
NIO/USSR
NIO/AL - Heymann
NIO/AL - Ford
NIO/E

SECRET